

THE DAILY JOURNAL

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1900.

Telephone Calls (Old and New).

Business Office...238 | Editorial Rooms...80

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

BY CARRIER-INDIANAPOLIS AND SUBURBS.

Daily, Sunday included, 50 cents per month.

Daily, without Sunday, 40 cents per month.

Single copies: Daily, 2 cents; Sunday, 5 cents.

BY AGENTS ELSEWHERE:

Daily, per week, 10 cents.

Daily, Sunday included, per week, 15 cents.

Daily, without Sunday, per week, 10 cents.

By Mail PREPAID:

Daily edition, one year, \$5.00.

Daily and Sunday, one year, \$7.50.

Sunday only, one year, \$2.00.

REDUCED RATES TO CLUBS.

Weekly Edition.

One copy, one year, \$1.00.

Five cents per month for periods less than a year.

No subscription taken for less than three months.

REDUCED RATES TO CLUBS.

Subscribe with any of our numerous agents or

send subscription to the

JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,

Indianapolis, Ind.

Persons sending the Journal through the mails

to the United States should put on an eight-cent

paper a ONE-CENT postage stamp; on a twelve

cent paper a TWO-CENT postage stamp. Foreign postage is usually double these rates.

All communications intended for publication in

this paper must, in order to receive attention,

be accompanied by the name and address of the

author. Manuscripts will not be returned unless

postage is enclosed for that purpose.

Entered as second-class matter at Indianapolis,

Ind., postoffice.

THE INDIANAPOLIS JOURNAL.

Can be found at the following places:

NEW YORK-Astor House and Fifth-avenue

Hotel.

CHICAGO-Palmer House, P. O. News Co., 217

Madison street.

CINCINNATI-J. R. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine

street.

LOUISVILLE-C. T. Deering, northwest corner

of Third and Jefferson streets, and Louisville

Book Co., 226 Fourth avenue.

ST. LOUIS-Union News Company, Union Depot.

WASHINGTON-D. C.-Riggs House, Ebbitt

House and Willard's Hotel.

"If there is anyone who believes

the gold standard is a good thing, or

that it must be maintained, I warn

him not to cast his vote for me, be-

cause I promise him it will not be

maintained in this country longer

than I am able to get rid of it."-WILLIAM

JENNINGS BRYAN, Knoxville, Tenn., Sept. 16, 1896.

"The party stands where it did in

1896 on the money question."-WILLIAM

JENNINGS BRYAN, Zanesville, O., Sept. 4, 1900.

Another and a harder frost!

Mr. Hearst's \$50,000 to get a crowd did

not bring it.

The mountain of National Democratic

clubs has labored and brought forth a

mouse.

Some were mean enough to say there

were not as many people in town yesterday

as there were the day before.

The Journal invokes the Democrats to

have a little pride and make an effort to

give Mr. Bryan a house to-day.

Some stronger word than a frost is re-

quired to express yesterday's failure. It

was a shower bath of liquid air.

Evidently Mr. Hearst felt it in the air

and stayed away from his well-planned

funeral. Did Mr. Creelman notify him?

Counting chickens before they are

hatched is a safe business compared with

estimating Democratic crowds before they

appear.

The local Democracy went to bed last

night sorehearted. Every man in the town

felt the damp death-chill in the marrow of

his bones.

The Democratic atmospheric depression

in this city made Mr. Hearst ill in Chicago

and sent several to bed here. It was a

killing frost.

Just now it seems that the few who did

come to the Hearst performance painfully

not know upon what charges they had been

held, and no record showed. This is the

sort of government, and worse, that Mr.

Bryan would restore in the Philippines.

EX-PRESIDENT HARRISON.

The announcement that ex-President

Harrison will shortly take part in the

campaign will be gratifying to all Repub-

licans. There is no American living whose

views on public questions carry more

weight with the people or who has the

faculty of presenting them in a more force-

ful and attractive manner than General

Harrison. The limitations of his position

as an ex-President prevent him from tak-

ing an active part in politics, and his care-

ful observance of the proprieties makes

him shun interviews on the subject. His

silence thus far has been misconstrued

by some as indicating a lack of interest

in the campaign or indifference as to the re-

sult, but no one who knows him has en-

tertained such an idea. General Harrison

is an American of Americans, a Repub-

lican of Republicans, and the issues of a

presidential election would have to be very

unimportant and the position of the Re-

publican party very wrong for him not to

take a lively interest in the result. The

issues of the present campaign are such

as to appeal strongly to his patriotic in-

stincts as well as to his political convic-

tions. A lifelong and ardent supporter

of a protective tariff, an unwavering ad-

vocate of sound money and opponent of

free silver, a veteran of the civil war and

defender of the flag, conscientious and

conservative in all his views, there is no-

thing in the batch of political heresies and

isms that make up Bryanism to excite

anything but his hearty contempt. An at-

tempt has been made to create the im-

pression that General Harrison does not

approve of the President's Philippine

policy. The Journal ventures the pre-

diction that when he speaks it will be

found to fully approve of it. No one

knows better than he that it is the con-

stitutional duty of the President to en-

force the laws of the United States and

suppress insurrection against its lawful

authority, and no one knows better than

he that a treaty is part of the supreme law

of the land and that it is as much the duty

of the President to enforce the treaty

rights of the United States as any other

law. To quote his own words: "The Pres-

ident cannot go beyond the law, and he

cannot stop short of it. His duty and his

oath of office take it all in and leave him

no discretion, save as to the means to be

employed." If General Harrison were in

President McKinley's place he would be

doing just what the latter is doing—us-

ing the army of the United States to sup-

press insurrection and establish the author-

ity of the United States in territory rightly

belonging to it.

It may be said without exaggeration

that General Harrison inaugurated the era

of modern expansion by recommending the

annexation of Hawaii. In his message of

Feb. 15, 1898, transmitting the treaty of

annexation to the Senate, he said:

"Only two courses are now open—one, the

establishment of a protectorate by the

United States, and the other annexation

full and complete. The latter course

will be highly promotive of the best in-

terests of the Hawaiian people, and is the

only form of government not so

adequate that it might not serve for an

indefinite time.

This was the first time this question was

ever touched upon, and General Harrison,

with characteristic felicity of expression,

suggested that in the matter of statehood

the quality of the inhabitants should be

taken into account as well as their num-

bers.

No two executives ever do things in pre-

cisely the same way, and while it is quite

likely that General Harrison, if President,

would have done some things differently

from President McKinley, there can be no

doubt that he would have done many

things in precisely the same way as he

has done. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

is not in their principles, but in their

methods. The difference between them

that of to-day will be still smaller. What-

ever he may be in other places Mr. Bryan

is no longer a drawing card in Indiana.

Four years ago to-day Mr. Bryan was

touring the South and talking free silver

as the paramount issue. At Memphis he

said:

"If we must have the gold dollar because

foreign nations insist upon it, then I think

we should change it and in the place of that

face above which is written 'Liberty' let

us have a picture of a woman in chains

wiped out, and the war in the Transvaal

take no new complications, then will I be

the first to accept the peace that I believe

to be necessary, though it be at the cost of

acknowledging the sovereignty of the

United States, since I consider that our

forces are now impotent to defend our

sacred and legitimate rights."